American Free Press
Vol XIV No. 23/24 June 9 & 16, 2014 americanfreepress.net

An unabashed nationalist, Sen. Robert A. Taft—who worked to prevent U.S. involvement in needless foreign wars—still acknowledged the need for the U.S. to engage with the rest of the world. As hard as it is to believe, Barack Obama's recent West Point speech almost reflects basic agreement with Taft's worldview, but tempered with a liberal internationalist flavor. However, many still say Obama's speech was double-talk.

Peace in Our Time?

- **President Obama's comments during West Point speech have warmongering foreign policy elites in a lather**

By Michael Collins Piper

In a recent foreign policy address at West Point, President Barack Obama tried to impose a modest degree of restraint in U.S. intervention and adventurism abroad while adhering to the traditional internationalist mantra in basic principle. However, his minor deviation from the norm was enough to scare the globalists, whose interests are ably voiced by newspapers like *The Washington Post.*

The almost hysterical tone of the *Post*'s May 29 editorial response to Obama's remarks was almost as if Obama had said something nice about Adolf Hitler.

The *Post* asserted Obama had rejected "decades of U.S. foreign policy" — that he's tying America's hands on foreign affairs, limiting U.S. opportunities to engage in military intervention around the world.

"This binding of U.S. power," the *Post* cried, "places Mr. Obama at odds with every U.S. president since World War II."

Well, from the standpoint of intelligent folks who've been observing decades of U.S. foreign policy — that sounds like a good thing.

The *Post* complained Obama "in effect, [ruled] out interventions to stop genocide or reverse aggression absent a direct threat to the U.S. homeland or a multilateral initiative."

The idea that the U.S. should place America first rather than spend trillions policing the world is anathema to the Post, which has always found the concept that the United States should refrain from engaging in endless military ventures to be quite sinister, quite threatening — even "un-American."

The *Post* complained Obama has "retrenched U.S. global engagement in a way that has shaken the confidence of many U.S. allies and encouraged some adversaries.

That conclusion can be heard not just from Republican hawks but also from senior officials from Singapore to France and, more quietly, from some leading congressional Democrats."

A predictable voice for the foreign policy establishment, for the Democratic Party and for "liberal internationalism," the *Post* took special delight in rushing to point out that not only top Democrats but even the Post's traditional GOP foes were horrified by Obama's remarks, underscoring, if anything, that there's very little difference between Democrats and Republicans when it comes to foreign policy.

So the Post's assertion regarding the united bipartisan frenzy in response to Obama's remarks is not really surprising. In fact, during recent years, liberal internationalism and conservative internationalism have converged in many ways. As such, it is impossible to differentiate between "Republican" foreign policy and "Democratic" foreign policy.

However, as Willis Carto noted in the book *Populism vs. Plutocracy*, there can be no such thing as a liberal foreign policy or a conservative foreign policy; there can only be a nationalist foreign policy or an internationalist foreign policy. And the truth is both major parties have attached themselves to internationalism.

Now, Obama is no "nationalist" by any means, but his West Point rhetoric, at least, comes about as close to the nationalist point of view as we've heard from any White House in a long time.

And note this: Obama's rhetoric is hardly different, in many respects, from that of the legendary figure known in the mid-20th century as "Mr. Republican," the late Sen. Robert A. Taft (R-Ohio) who valiantly fought for years against warmongering and foreign meddling.

To the degree we can weigh the broad sweep of Obama's West Point rhetoric — without dissecting it in detail — we can only say "Obama is right." And while that assertion may inflame those who don't like the guy in the White House, it happens to be the case.

Clearly enough to put the *Post* in a panic, Obama's foreign policy recommendations are a welcome departure from the perpetual unabashed advocacy for global meddling and wars without end coming from the likes of Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Lindsey Graham(R-S.C.) and rising GOP voices like Sens. Ted Cruz (Texas) and Marco Rubio (Fla.), all of whom want Americans to be forever battling ghosts and goblins — especially Muslims and, sooner than later, "them Rooshins" — all over the planet.

Michael Collins Piper is the author of ***Final Judgment***, the controversial "underground bestseller" documenting the collaboration of Israeli intelligence in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. He is also the author of ***The New Babylon***, ***The High Priests of War***, ***The New Jerusalem: Zionist Power in America*** , ***The Judas Goats: The Enemy Within***, ***Dirty Secrets: Crime, Conspiracy & Cover-Up in the 20th Century***, ***The GOLEM: Israel's Hell Bomb***, and ***Target: Traficant.*** These works can be found at America First Books and First Amendment Books: 1-888-699-NEWS. He has lectured on suppressed topics in places as diverse as Malaysia, Japan, Canada, Russia and Abu Dhabi.

(Issue Number 23 & 24; June 9 & 16, 2014, AMERICAN FREE PRESS)